

Remarks

In the present response, six claims (1-3 and 11-13) are amended. No new matter is entered. Claims 1- 20 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action argues that the term “human support” was not defined in the specification. This rejection is moot since claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are amended to remove the word “human.”

Claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reciting “human support representative.” This rejection is moot since claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are amended to remove the word “human.”

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4 – 9, 11, and 14 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by USPN 6,052,531 (Waldin). Applicant respectfully traverses.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Waldin neither teaches nor suggests each element in the rejected claims, these claims are allowable over Waldin.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Waldin. For example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

a requesting system coupled to the Internet **from which a user requests assistance from a support representative** wherein said **user utilizes a Web browser client to request said assistance.**

The Office Action cites Waldin at col. 4, lines 1 – 12 for teaching these recitations. This section is reproduced below for convenience:

Referring to FIG. 1, a virus protection software application 110 which incorporates a number of virus detecting routines 112, and utilizes a number of data files containing virus information 114, is installed on a user's computer 116. Because of the rate at which new viruses are created, it is desirable to update the virus protection software applications on the user's computer frequently. These updates could take place as often as daily, or even more frequently if desired. Generally, these updated applications 110 will include only small changes to the data files 114, but sometimes larger changes to the virus detecting routines 112 will also be included.

Nowhere, for example, does this section of Waldin teach or suggest that a user requests assistance from a support representative. Further, nowhere does this section of Waldin teach or suggest that a user utilizes a Web browser client to request the assistance. In fact, nowhere does Waldin even discuss browsers or users utilizing browsers to request assistance.

In response to Applicant's argument, the Office Action contends that "Waldin discloses that a user's virus protection software is updated. An update is a request from a user from a support representative" (see OA mailed 09/15/06 at p. 6). For several reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, claim 1 recites that a user utilizes the Web browser to request **assistance from a support representative**. Waldin is directed to distributing incremental patches to update virus protection software to users. Nowhere does Waldin teach or suggest that a user uses a web browser to request "assistance from a support representative." Second, claim 1 recites that a "user" uses the browser to make a request for assistance. Waldin does not mention anywhere that **users** make requests for assistance from a support representative. By contrast, Waldin explicitly teaches that a program on the user's computer retrieves update software patches: "The updater program

126 determines what patch files 122 are necessary, retrieves them and applies them to the application to be updated 110” (col. 4, lines 38-40).

As yet another example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

a support representative system coupled to the Internet from
which a support representative **responds to the requesting user to
provide assistance.**

The Office Action cites Waldin at col. 4, lines 17 – 24 for teaching these recitations. This section is reproduced below for convenience:

Each time an updated software application 110 is produced by the virus protection software publisher, the updated form of the software application constitutes a new version. The software publisher uses an incremental update builder, such as binary patch file builder 120, to produce at least one incremental update, such as binary patch file 122, which can transform a previous version of the software application to the current version.

Nowhere, for example, does this section of Waldin teach or suggest that the support representative system responds to the requesting user to provide assistance. As noted above, the user in Waldin does not make a request. Instead, an updater program in the user’s computer determines what patch files are necessary and retrieves them (see col. 4, lines 38-40). So, a “user” never makes a request in Waldin. Further, claim 1 recites that the user requests “assistance.” Requests for assistance are not taught or suggested in Waldin. Instead, Waldin teaches methods and apparatus for distributing software update patches.

As still yet another example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

a collaboration server system ... **for receiving a request from the user for assistance and for processing said request for assistance.**

The Office Action cites Waldin at col. 8, lines 28 – 57 for teaching these recitations. Applicant scrutinized this section. Nowhere does this section teach or suggest that the collaboration server system is for receiving a request **from a user** for assistance and for processing the request for assistance. This section of Waldin does not even mention receiving requests for assistance from users. In Waldin, requests for assistance are never made. Instead, Waldin teaches that an updater program in the user's computer determines what patch files are necessary and retrieves them (see col. 4, lines 38-40).

In response to Applicant's argument, the Office Action contends that "Waldin discloses the representative sends the update (column 4 lines 35-40)." For several reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, column 4, lines 35-40 of Waldin teach that an updater program in the user's computer determines what patch files are necessary and retrieves them. Notice that this section of Waldin does not teach or suggest receiving a "request from the user for assistance." Instead, a program in the user's computer retrieves patch files from a server ("The binary patch files 122 are stored on an update data source 124 (a server) which makes the patch files available to an updater program 126." See col. 4, lines 35-38).

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Waldin. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

As yet another example, claim 1 recites communications between the user and the support representative "in presence of firewall protection in said requesting system and in said support representative system." Waldin does not even mention firewalls.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Waldin. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

Claim 11

Independent claim 11 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Waldin. For example, claim 11 recites (emphasis added):

a rendezvous service, **responsive to receipt of a request for assistance generated by a user of a Web browser client** operating on said requesting system.

Nowhere does Waldin teach or suggest a service that is responsive to receipt of a request for assistance generated by a user of a Web browser client. In fact, Waldin does not teach or suggest the use of a browser as claimed. The Office Action cites several sections of Waldin (namely, col. 4, lines 1 – 12, 17 – 24 and col. 8, lines 28 – 57). None of these sections disclose or suggest a service that is responsive to receipt of a request for assistance.

FIG. 1 of Waldin shows a user computer 116 coupled to a server 124 and software publisher 118. Waldin does not teach or suggest that either the server 124 or the software publisher 118 receives a request for assistance from a user of a web browser. Requests for assistance are not mentioned in Waldin. Instead, Waldin teaches a program in the user's computer retrieves patch files from a server. "The binary patch files 122 are stored on an update data source 124 (a server) which makes the patch files available to an updater program 126" (see col. 4, lines 35-38).

As another example, claim 11 recites the following:

a rendezvous service ... to initiate communications via the Internet between said user and support personnel at said support representative system, said requesting system and said support representative system each having firewall protection.

Again, Waldin does not discuss communications with "support personnel." Further, Waldin does not even discuss firewall protection. Nowhere does Waldin teach or suggest a rendezvous service that initiates communication between a user and support personnel with the requesting system and the support representative system each having firewall protection.

For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over Waldin. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 11.

III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,802,518 (Karaev). Applicant respectfully traverses.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Karaev neither teaches nor suggests each element in the rejected claims, these claims are allowable over Karaev.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Karaev. As one example, claim 1 recites communications between the user and the support representative “in presence of firewall protection in said requesting system and in said support representative system.” Karaev does not even mention firewalls.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Karaev. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

As another example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

a requesting system coupled to the Internet **from which a user requests assistance from a support representative** wherein said **user utilizes a Web browser client to request said assistance.**

The Office Action cites Karaev at col. 3, lines 47-57 for teaching these recitations. This section is reproduced below for convenience:

According to the representative embodiment of the present invention, each user has a user computer, such as, for example, a personal computer with an Intel Pentium processor and a fast

modem that the user can use to connect to the Internet. The user computer has one or more local storage devices. In the representative embodiment, the user computer executes Netscape's Navigator 2.1 browser program. However, other browser programs, such the Mosaic browser or Microsoft's Internet Explorer 2.0 browser could also be used. As used herein, the browser programs executed by the user computer will be termed "Internet browsers.

Nowhere, for example, does this section of Karaev teach or suggest that a user requests assistance from a support representative. In fact, nowhere does Karaev even discuss browsers or users utilizing browsers to request assistance from support representatives.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Karaev. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

As yet another example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

a support representative system coupled to the Internet from which a support representative **responds to the requesting user to provide assistance**.

The Office Action cites Karaev at col. 4, lines 6 – 14 for teaching these recitations. This section is reproduced below for convenience:

In the representative embodiment, the repository server can provide the user with a list of new documents that have been recently received by the repository server and which that user is authorized to access. The user may also request a list of documents that fit certain user-specified search criteria. A list of the documents that match that search criteria and which the user is

authorized to access is provided to the user computer. The user can then select, request and view documents from these lists.

Nowhere, for example, does this section of Karaev teach or suggest that the support representative responds to the requesting user to provide assistance. This section merely states that a server (not a support representative) responds to a user.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Karaev. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

Claim 11

Independent claim 11 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Karaev. For example, claim 11 recites the following:

a rendezvous service ... to initiate communications via the Internet between said user and support personnel at said support representative system, said requesting system and said support representative system each having firewall protection.

Again, Karaev does not discuss communications with “support personnel.” Further, Karaev does not even discuss firewall protection. Nowhere does Karaev teach or suggest a rendezvous service that initiates communication between a user and support personnel with the requesting system and the support representative system each having firewall protection.

For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over Karaev. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 11.

IV. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldin. Applicant respectfully traverses.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or

in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these criteria.

As noted above, Waldin does not teach or suggest all the limitations in independent claims 1 and 11. Dependent claims 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, and 20 depend from respective independent claims 1 and 11. Thus, for at least the reasons given above, Waldin does not teach or suggest all the limitations in dependent claims 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, and 20.

Challenge to Official Notice

In rejecting claims 2 and 12, the “examiner takes official notice that it is known to have humans beings respond to service updates to provide a more personal and user-friendly environment. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a human representative walk a user through an update in Waldin” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Per MPEP § 2144.03, Applicant challenges the factual assertion as not properly officially noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge. As such, Applicant asks the Examiner to provide adequate **documentary evidence**.

In rejecting claims 10 and 20, the “examiner takes official notice that using a key of at least 128 bits is well known in the art to increase security. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to sign use a key of at least 128 bits to sign the response in Waldin.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Per MPEP § 2144.03, Applicant challenges the factual assertion as not properly officially noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge. As such, Applicant asks the Examiner to provide adequate **documentary evidence**.

In rejecting claims 2, 3 12, and 13, the “examiner takes official notice that it is known to have humans beings respond to requests to provide a more personal and user-friendly environment. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to

have a human representative walk a user through a query in Karaev” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Per MPEP § 2144.03, Applicant challenges the factual assertion as not properly officially noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge. As such, Applicant asks the Examiner to provide adequate **documentary evidence**.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529